

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3-7, 9-11, 15 and 16 are all the claims pending in the application.

I. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

A. Claims 1, 3, 4, 7, 9, 15 and 16 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sonner et al. (US 2003/0007092) in view of Jung et al. (US 4,862,290), and further in view of Juneau (US 2005/0108529).

Claim 1 recites that said function processing unit is further operable to cause, when the camera function has been activated, said display unit to display a function processing image instead of the broadcast contents while said outline presentation unit presents the outline, so that the presentation of the outline and the display of the function processing image are performed simultaneously.

Applicants respectfully submit that the cited prior art references do not teach, suggest or otherwise render obvious the above-noted feature recited in claim 1 for at least the following reasons.

Regarding Sonner, Applicants note that this reference discloses an interactive television system which displays a television program such as a sporting contest, together with information related to that sport, such as play-by-play information (e.g., see paragraphs [0062] and [0084]).

Regarding Jung, Applicants note that this reference discloses a video tape recording and reproducing device 10, a tuner 30 for receiving television broadcast signals, a camera 40 for generating and supplying video and audio signals to the recording and reproducing device 10, and a signal selector 80 (see Fig. 1). As explained in Jung, the signal selector 80 enables “selection as the signal input source for the recording and reproducing device 10 either the tuner

30, the camera 40 or an exterior auxiliary input jack 33, 34 in response to a selection control signal SEL (see col. 2, line 66 through col. 3, line 2) (emphasis added).

In the Office Action, the Examiner has indicated that (i) the play-by-play information of Sonner corresponds to the “outline” set forth in claim 1, and (ii) the output from the camera 40 of Jung corresponds to the “function processing image” set forth in claim 1, and has taken the position that the combination of Sonner and Jung would result in the claimed feature which indicates that the “presentation of the outline and the display of the function processing image are performed simultaneously”.

Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner’s above-noted position that the combination of Sonner and Jung would result in the claimed feature which indicates that the “presentation of the outline and the display of the function processing image are performed simultaneously”.

In particular, Applicants note that because Jung merely discloses the ability to switch between the camera 40 and the tuner 30, that even if the teaching of Jung was combined with Sonner, that the resulting combination would merely result in a switch between (i) a screen showing a television program with an outline and (ii) an image captured by the camera, and would not result in the simultaneous display of the image captured by the camera and the outline.

Accordingly, contrary to the position taken in the Office Action, Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of Sonner and Jung does not teach, suggest or otherwise render obvious the above-noted feature recited in claim 1 which indicates that that said function processing unit is further operable to cause, when the camera function has been activated, said display unit to display a function processing image instead of the broadcast contents while said

outline presentation unit presents the outline, so that the presentation of the outline and the display of the function processing image are performed simultaneously.

Further, Applicants respectfully submit that Conkwright does not cure the above-noted deficiencies of Sonner and Jung. In this regard, Applicants note that Conkwright has been relied upon merely for the teaching of a technique related to SureView for forcing a user to view advertisements.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that the cited prior references do not teach, suggest or otherwise render obvious the above-noted feature recited in claim 1. As such, Applicants submit that claim 1 is patentable over the cited prior art, an indication of which is kindly requested.

In addition, Applicants note that claim 1 has been amended to recite the features of a judging unit operable to judge that the broadcast contents should not be displayed when the camera function is activated; and a display control unit operable to perform image processing on the stream information of the broadcast wave received by said receiving unit, and to cause said display unit to display the broadcast contents, when said judging unit judges that the broadcast contents should be displayed, and to put a broadcast receiving function in a background state by stopping the image processing and concurrently causing said receiving unit to receive the broadcast wave, when said judging unit judges that the broadcast contents should not be displayed.

Applicants respectfully submit that the cited prior art references also do not teach or suggest the above-noted feature recited in claim 1.

In particular, as noted above, because Jung merely discloses the ability to switch between the camera 40 and the tuner 30, Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of Jung,

Sonner and Conkwright would clearly not result in a system in which a broadcast receiving function is put in a background state (a state in which a broadcast wave is received, but program contents are not shown) when the camera is activated.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that the combination of Jung, Sonner and Conkwright, would not render obvious the above-noted features recited in amended claim 1 of a judging unit operable to judge that the broadcast contents should not be displayed when the camera function is activated; and a display control unit operable to perform image processing on the stream information of the broadcast wave received by said receiving unit, and to cause said display unit to display the broadcast contents, when said judging unit judges that the broadcast contents should be displayed, and to put a broadcast receiving function in a background state by stopping the image processing and concurrently causing said receiving unit to receive the broadcast wave, when said judging unit judges that the broadcast contents should not be displayed.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 is patentable over the cited prior art references, an indication of which is kindly requested.

Regarding claims 3, 4, 7 and 9, Applicants note that these claims depend from claim 1 and are therefore considered patentable at least by virtue of their dependency.

Regarding claims 15 and 16, Applicants note that each of these claims recites similar features as claim 1, and are therefore believed to be patentable over the cited prior art for reasons at least similar to those as discussed above with respect to claim 1.

In particular, Applicants note that claims 15 and 16 recite that in said function processing step, when the camera function has been activated, the display unit is caused to display a function processing image instead of the broadcast contents while the outline is presented in said outline presentation step, so that the presentation of the outline and the display of the function

processing image are performed simultaneously; as well as the features of a judging step of judging that the broadcast contents should not be displayed when the camera function is activated, and a display control step of executing an image processing on the stream information of the broadcast wave received in said receiving step and causing the broadcast contents to be displayed on a display unit, when it is judged, in said judging step, that the broadcast contents should be displayed, and putting a broadcast receiving function in a background state by stopping the image processing and concurrently causing the broadcast wave to be received in said receiving step, when it is judged, in said judging step, that the broadcast contents should not be displayed.

For reasons at least similar to those discussed above with respect to claim 1, Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of Sonner, Jung and Conkwright, does not teach, suggest or otherwise render obvious the above-noted features recited in amended claims 15 and 16. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claims 15 and 16 are patentable over the cited prior art, an indication of which is kindly requested.

B. Claim 5 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sonner et al. (US 2003/0007092) in view of Jung et al. (US 4,862,290) and Conkwright (US 2002/0133490), and further in view of Kwoh (US 6,115,057).

Claim 5 depends from claim 1. Applicants submit that Kwoh fails to cure the deficiencies of Sonner, Jung and Conkwright, with respect to amended claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claim 6 is patentable at least by virtue of its dependency.

C. Claim 6 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sonner et al. (US 2003/0007092) in view of Jung et al. (US 4,862,290) and Conkwright (US 2002/0133490), and further in view of Tsukagoshi (US 5,684,542).

Claim 6 depends from claim 1. Applicants submit that Tsukagoshi fails to cure the deficiencies of Sonner, Jung and Conkwright, with respect to amended claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claim 6 is patentable at least by virtue of its dependency.

D. Claims 10 and 11 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sonner et al. (US 2003/0007092) in view of Jung et al. (US 4,862,290) and Conkwright (US 2002/0133490), and further in view of Lee et al. (US 2001/0049296).

Claims 10 and 11 depend from claim 1. Applicants submit that Lee fails to cure the deficiencies of Sonner, Jung and Conkwright, as discussed above, with respect to amended claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claims 10 and 11 are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency.

II. Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited.

If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may best be resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Kohei YAMAGUCHI et al.

/Kenneth W. Fields/

By 2010.11.30 14:58:23 -05'00'

Kenneth W. Fields
Registration No. 52,430
Attorney for Applicants

KWF/jmj
Washington, D.C. 20005-1503
Telephone (202) 721-8200
Facsimile (202) 721-8250
November 30, 2010